DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 135 EC 092 963

AUTHOR Burns, Harriet P.
TITLE Emotional Problems of the Learning Disabled.
PUB DATE Aug 76
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the International Scientific Conference of IPLD (3rd, Montreal, Canada, August 9-13, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Problems; Delinquency; Elementary Secondary Education; Emotional Problems; *Learning Disabilities; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

In discussing the problem of emotional and behavioral disturbance in children with learning disabilities (LD), the author suggests that teachers trained in LD are given little background in emotional problems, that LD texts contain minimal information about dealing with behavioral disturbance, and that the connection between LD and delinquency has been overstated. Other ways in which children with emotional problems are seen to be ill-served include the changing and frequently turbulent structure of educational settings. Educators and administrators are urged to take such actions as interpreting the field of LD realistically to the public and advocating behavior training for regular and special education teachers. (CL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED135135

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Emotional Problems of the Learning Disabled

Harriet P. Burns

EC09963

Paper presented to the International Federation of Learning Disabilities in Montreal, Canada, August 10, 1976, by Dr. Harriet P. Burns, Ph.D., Director of Special Education, St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minnesota.

I would like to discuss with you today, an area in Learning Disabilities in which there is great need for at least clarification -- a very minimal step at best. Hopefully, you may agree that clarification is just the tip of the iceberg and you will bring to bear on the problem your considerable skill and expertise. The area which I intend to discuss here is the area of emotional problems of children, their relationship to learning disabilities, and the confusion among educators, the public, professional disciplines, and community agencies as to whom should carry responsibility for what.

I come to you with some 25 years of experience in working with children in a wide variety of settings -- Settlement House work, work in psychiatric units, work in delinquency units, regular school teaching, special education teaching, special education administration and program development, and I am now the Director of a graduate program for the preparation of teachers in the areas of Learning Disabilities and Emotionally Disturbed. My initial goal was that of working with children and the community. I find that college professors, to really validate the value of their instruction, must use it in the field, and so I continue to work with children and the community. I tell you this because I have a decided bias which you will soon discover and I want you to know it is biased on a little more than what I have read someplace, or on something someone else told me.

My bias is that the child with emotional and behavioral problems is the low man on the totem pole of education, and not only are we not improving

EC092963

his lot, we are making it worse. He is difficult to diagnose, dangerous to label, detrimental to our well organized classrooms, disobedient toward regulations, disparaging towards our intervention, and most of all, and something we frequently forget, he is desperate -- desperately trying to bring order to his chaotic existence.

I think we ought to look carefully at how this child relates to the Learning Disabilities Programs. In some states, the Emotional Disturbed child is included in the definition of Learning Disabilities, and in some states he is placed in other programs. The question asked is whether or not his emotional problems cause the learning disability or whether the learning disability causes the emotional problems. It is not an important question. The questions to be asked are two separate questions -- (1) does this child have a specific disability in the area of learning, (2) does this child have emotional problems of great enough magnitude to interfere with learning? A third question might be whether or not there is an interaction between these two problems, in what specific areas and under what circumstances? The old "which came first, the chicken or the egg" is not only a tiresome question, but it leads to a reluctance to address the problem at all.

We are long on diagnostic skills and short on treatment for many types of handicaps and emotional disturbance is probably the most severly affected. Diagnosing emotional problems is not the issue. We have available some sophisticated teacher tools to identify, record, describe, and evaluate behavior. Without going into the details I might cite my own study, done in 1973, in which 115 teachers, half of them regular education teachers and half of them learning disabilities teachers were asked to view three tapes of children with behavioral problems and record behaviors. The group was also divided equally as to

elementary and secondary teachers. One of the findings of the study was the educators - all educators had common and highly developed skills in identifying and describing behaviors. There also was no difference between the skills of the regular educator and the special educator. Teachers, across the board, then, are skilled in identifying and describing accurately the behaviors of children. The problems lie in what to do about them. You might also be interested in the fact that these teachers, across the board, noted few positive behaviors, although there were many. Children do not emit only negative behaviors. Out of 2824 behaviors reported, 2127 were rated as negative, 66 neutral, and 631 positive. It seems that when you ask teachers to observe and note behaviors they interpret that as meaning negative behaviors, which makes one wonder what our level of reinforcement for positive behaviors is in the classroom. If we are so tuned in to negative behaviors how careful are we about reinforcing and thereby accelerating positive behaviors? A little food for thought, perhaps.

As we most freqnently include emotional and behavioral problems under the Learning Disabilities umbrella, we put these children with teachers whose sole emphasis in teacher preparation and certification preparation has been on the diagnosis and remediation of children with specific learning disabilities in academic areas. This is just half the problems of these children.

We set up unrealistic expectations that every Learning Disabilities teacher also is equipped personality-wise, and interest-wise to work with children who have many types of emotional and behavioral problems.

We allow that harassed specialist a minimum of time to work with these children -- time in which she is expected to work miracles in academic

remediation and also to solve life-long, emotional problems of children.

We, as learning disabilities teachers and administrators, placidly accept this responsibility and generally fail in the area of behavior. We do not insist that the responsibility of changing the behavior of children is a school-wide responsibility because the child must have consistent handling for the entire day. We know that is true. Then why don't we make it clear to administration and to other school staff? We certainly are not serving children well by remaining quiet on this issue.

We stand by and watch problem-ridden children be placed in chaotic open-school settings which are best designed for children with well developed inner controls.

We work poorly with parents of these children because (1) we let someone else carry that responsibility -- thereby fragmenting the impact of our services (2) we are not trained and do not feel adequate in this area or (3) we do not have sufficient time to work with parents.

We are part of the development of many "schools within schools" or "pocket schools" or "special settings" which are inappropriately designed, ineffective, cleverly divorced from regular education, and based on a surface philosophy that they are an alternate path to a quality education. In a well structured, well designed, integrated setting they may well be a very possible answer, but we do not insist upon those requirements for those programs.

I do not have to tell you how confusing the term "Learning Disabilities" is, nor how all inclusive it has become in our land. It means all things

to some people and nothing to many others. Having made our pitch for those children who had average or above intelligence but were not learning in our schools, and having garnered funding for individualized help for those children, we were able to effect some very drastic and comprehensive changes in education to serve those children. It was a magnificent and fruitful endeavor for children who had need for such help. It was a difficult and painful process. We made the public, the legislatures, and even the Court systems aware of the need. We got across the message that there were thousands of children in our school systems who were not learning and it was the fault of education more than the fault of the child. This was indeed a healthy move.

Somehow, in our ecstasy of being able to effect change, and in order to support our campaign, we began claiming more and more children for the army of the learning disabled. The numbers grew from less than 1% of our child population (which probably was low) to estimates of up to 25% and even as high as 40%. It all depended upon what definition was used. We included economically deprived children, delinquent children, gifted children, culturally different children, educationally disadvantaged children, non-English speaking children, and children with behavioral and emotional problems. There was no limit to what we included in this vast army of the learning disabled. We demanded specially trained teachers to teach these children -- the regular education teacher would not do.

Teacher training programs sprang up overnight, and few of them died because there was very little monitoring of the content or of the quality. A bad program could flourish because the need for certification for these teachers was critical. Most of the training programs concentrated

on the diagnosis and remediation of specific learning programs in academic areas, particularly reading. This was all right because that was the focal area of need. It is still all right if the impact of the program is on specific learning disabilities.

However, the fact that many children were manifesting behavioral problems in our schools and community on one hand, and the fact that teachers with special training in teaching problem children were available in schools (and reimbursed by the State) on the other hand, led to the pressure to serve, in addition to the truly learning disabled, the child with emotional and behavioral problems. We were under pressure to make full use of this extra specialized teaching personnel, and who else would serve those children? Someone had to get them out of the classroom. The fact that the teachers were not equipped to serve these children did not seem to matter. The programs changed from SLD (Special Learning Disabilities) to SLBP (Special Learning and Behavioral Problems). Not only did this effect the child with behavioral problems -- he was not well served -- but -- it also cut down on the amount of time that could be spent with children who had specific learning disabilities. Learning Disabilities teachers were not equipped to work with the one group of youngsters and they did not have time to work with the youngsters they were trained to help.

Did training programs change? No, programs continued to train teachers in the same way as before. Changing a teacher preparation program in a large institution is not an easy task. The important point is that we have not served disturbed children well, and we have compounded their problems. We routed them off to an already harassed teacher who could not give them more than superficial help in the areas of behavior and then we marked this population "served".

In preparation for this presentation I examined carefully ten learning disabilities texts which have been published since 1969. Well, one was published in 1969 and the other nine in 1975 and 1976. I wanted to see whether in these more recent texts there was more material addressing to the behavioral and emotional problems of children. I found:

1. There was increased emphasis on ways to diagnose emotional problems -- an area in which we already have skills, but;

2. There was almost nothing on what to do about the emotional or behavioral problems once they were diagnosed.

Those same texts were rich in how to diagnose and remediate specific learning disabilities. Some of the experienced giants in the field such as Cruickshank and Kirk did point out problems in working with emotional disturbances, and did recommend remediation methods. Cruickshank, particularly, in his book, EDUCATION OF EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN AND YOUTH, pointed out the present limitations in teacher training programs in this area. Hewett and Gardner in their respective books, tied the presence of emotional problems and methods for possible remediation in those areas very closely together into the learning disabilities approach. However, there is still little information on the management of behavioral and emotional problems in learning disabilities text books -- how then do we justify the placement of these children in that program? One text stated very clearly and I thought rather bravely that such children would not be well served in a learning disabilities program. One text on gifted children simply ignored the whole problem with a toss of the head, stating that children who were gifted intellectually seldom have behavioral problems. I place that statement on the same level as the statement in another text that if the disturbed child does not pay attention you should go over and physically force his head toward the

book. My years with disturbed children tells me that such a solution is less than satisfactory is you value life and limb.

In almost all of the text there was very little emphasis on the involvement of the child in the solution of his behavioral and/or emotional problems. The fact that a child has behavioral or emotional problems doesn't mean that he is stupid, or unaware, or lacks insight into his dilemma -- that he doesn't think clearly, that he doesn't feel, that he doesn't have ideas.

In a school for disturbed learning disabled children that I initiated and directed in the Minneapolis system, I experimented with a process I thoroughly believe in -- that of allowing the child to call conferences when he has a problem. I initiated a plan in which children had forms available in their rooms asking for a conference with whatever staff they felt they wanted to discuss a problem with. Teachers explained the forms to the children and helped them make them out even when the problem included the teacher. It was an excellent staff and they understood that if it was a problem in the child's eyes, it was worthy of respect and discussion. The children would walk in and place the form on my desk and I would try to call the staff indicated on the report, together before the day ended. One little boy, eight years old, came in with a request asking to see the teacher and myself. When we met, I said, "Timmy, would you like to explain what the problem is?" and he said, "When I go up to talk to the teacher, he never locks up at me. He always keeps working at something on his desk." I said, "Why does that bother you, Tim?", and he said, "Well, you know -- I am a person, and when I talk with somebody I like to have them look up at me and know that I am a person!" Eight year old wisdom! The teacher said, "Tim, you are absolutely right. You deserve my full attention when you speak to me." It was a valuable lesson.

Another complaint you might enjoy was from a nine year old boy who had requested in our initial interview that when a behavior crisis came up he not be touched physically. He would respond to verbal commands. When a crisis did come up, the teacher respected that decision and did not touch the boy. However, time passed and the boy did not respond to verbal commands. Finally, the teacher took him by the arm and ushered him physically to his destination. The youngster wrote out a request for conference slip and the complaint was that the teacher had violated the request. I said, "Well, Dennis, we have a lot of children to work with here in this school, and we cannot have one staff member standing waiting for a long period of time because one child does not want to hold up his end of the bargain. You did say you would respond to verbal requests and you did not." The teacher said, "Yes, Denny, we don't have that much patience either", and Denny looked up at him with surprise and said, "Well, if you don't have that much patience you shouldn't be in this type of work!" A little reverse counseling!

I might add that when I resigned from that school, they discontinued the process of child-initiated interviews, so probably there wasn't the enthusiasm that I imagined for the process. Be that as it may, my point is that the teacher working with children with behavioral or emotional problems must have the ability and time to listen to children and to plan management strategies with them. One must recognize that a teacher who is skilled in structuring learning tasks carefully and precisely may or may not have the skills needed to deal with behavioral problems. Hopefully, he/she does, but that is not always the case and where it is not the case it should be recognized. Either she must have supportive help in the areas of changing behavior or the child should be placed with a teacher or staff member who does have skills in the area of behavior.

Behavior patterns are often rigid and formed over a long period of time. It takes time to change them. The learning disabilities teacher cannot hope to deal with this aspect when she sees a large and varying group of children for limited time blocks each day. This is especially true when there is little support within the school staff to carry out the behavioral management recommendations of the learning disability teacher. These children need consistent handling all day long. That is why they often respond in day-long programs especially designed for them. To pretend to be able to help these children in a measureable way, when indeed, skill-wise and time-wise it is impossible, is to do them a great disservice.

Another area in which we have served behavioral problem and disturbed children poorly, and in fact compounded their problems, is in the area of interpreting to the public what part learning disabilities plays in the development of delinquency and emotional disturbance. I suppose it is rather ego-building to have people state that if children had only been taught to read that they would not be delinquent or disturbed. This makes the learning disabilities profession a hub of importance in a revolving community. It is ego-building at the expense of children. If all of the child's problems are based on his inability to read, then the only agency carrying responsibility for his delinquent patterns or his emotional problems is the school system, and even to narrow it down further, the special educator. Everyone else is "off the hook" -- his parents, his peers, his religious affiliations, his community, correctional institutions, the courts. They simply point to the fact that the school system has failed to give him the essential tools and therefore is responsible. That is just too simple an explanation. It is just too dangerous an assumption. Further more, it is not true.

Let us take a look at the area of juvenile delinquency and its relationship to academic skills - particularly reading. Certainly juvenile delinquency is increasing world-wise. Some countries are just more free in sharing their statistics than others. A rather shocking statistic from my own area of the country is that in Minnesota and Hennepin County (in which Minneapolis is located), the 1975 Hennepin County Crime Analysis report published by the Hennepin County Criminal Justice Council, states, "Persons under 18 years of age, who comprise 33.7% of the total Hennepin County population, accounted for 62% of all crimes of murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and auto theft." Those are major crime categories, unlike the usual juvenile offenses such as absenting from home, incorrigibility, etc. It states further, "By offense, juveniles accounted for over half of all arrests for robbery, burglary, larceny, and auto theft. Overall, juveniles accounted for 49% of all arrests for crimes against persons, and 64% of all arrests against property." In addition to these startling statistics we find that the high crime area, one located in the congested urban area, has now moved out to the suburbs where our best -- at least our more affluent schools, and populations exist. Children have great educational opportunities here - a large percentage go on to college. It is not just a characteristic of minority groups.

Is one of the major reasons that of the child's learning disability?

I am working on such a study, but I would like to share with you some of the data from one of the settings for delinquent girls -- that of the Home of Good Shepherd in the St. Paul, Minnesota area. One of the sad commentaries on our society is that the population of girls involved in crime is greatly accelerating. While absenting from home -- the

run aways -- has always been a crime of girls, there are now more girls frequently involved in the serious crimes. The Home of Good Shepherd is a residential treatment center for girls. Girls are sent there by the Courts. The school staff at the Home of Good Shepherd is under the direction of Dr. Gerald DuFour and Dr. DuFour and his staff are trained not only in the area of learning disabilities but also in the area of emotionally disturbed, so I know that their testing procedures are careful and accurate. The results of the reading tests administered to the following populations had the following results:

1. In examining the reading scores of 9 seventh grade girls entering the Home of Good Shepherd, we find that 44% of the girls scored above grade level in reading as measured by JASTAK reading test. The scores ranged from seven month above grade level to two years and one month above grade level.

2. In examining the reading scores of 19 eighth grade girls entering the institution, 47% scored above grade level in reading, ranging from one month to five years and two months.

3. In examining the reading scores of 31 ninth grade girls entering the institution, we find that 38% scored above grade level in reading ranging from six months above to three years and 6 months.

4. In examining the reading scores of 54 tenth grade girls entering the institution, we find that 43% scored above grade level, ranging from two months above to three years and five months above.

5. In examining the reading scores of 47 eleventh grade girls entering the institution we find that 28% scored above grade level in reading, ranging from three months above to two years above.

6. In examining the reading scores of 20 twelfth grade girls entering the institution, 35% scored above grade level in reading ranging from two months above to four years and eight months above.

It is interesting also to look at the range of reading scores of youths entering the Hennepin County Home School, a residential center for adjudicated youth. Principal Ronald Bragg, in two quarterly reports shows the wide range of reading scores for juveniles entering the institution. The upper ranges of reading, spelling and math tests indicate that children of higher ability are also delinquent.

It is also interesting that in many of the detention centers, residential centers, and community programs we now have to allow for gifted students and construct an enriched program for them during their stay in these facilities.

It is just too easy to blame it all on the schools and on learning disabilities. Of course, it is one component, and an important component for many children, but it is not a universal truth. The community, parents, families, churches, schools, correctional programs, and you and I as citizens must share the responsibility for what is happening to our young people. We must work cooperatively and intensely to bring about constructive changes, and each must hold the other accountable. Educators serve children poorly when they measure their impact unrealistically.

In the area of delinquency, there are many factors affecting the child's low scholastic progress, other than the lack of instruction. Some other considerations are:

1. Health and nutrituion problems which keep children out of school or make them less productive in school.
2. The transient patterns of families in low socio-economic areas. The child moves so frequently that he simply doesn't bother to adjust to any school. He just gives up.
3. Family problems which consume children's energy and inhibit his progress in school. The child does not come to school in an emotional state which allows him to attend to instruction.
4. Poor parenting. As parents we must assume that responsibility.
5. Low motivation for education in the home.
6. Low rewards economically and socially for academic achievement.

We must also recognize that delinquency and especially where the child is associated with a delinquent gang or group, offers the child some very attractive satisfactions -- satisfactions which we do not seem to

be able to offer him in school:

a. A sense of belonging to a closely knit group
b. A sense of security and protection in a peer group
c. a strong masculine identification for boys
d. recognition and acceptance for girls
e. monetary gains -- immediate gratification
f. the thrill of participation in a struggle.

The acceptance for what he is and recognition of his value are critical needs of children. If they do not find them in family, community, and school they will seek them in more deviant roles in society. We would do well to concentrate on the massive failures of our total society in meeting the emotional needs of today's children.

Another area -- that of emotional disturbance. In the area of emotional disturbance as related to reading, teachers from the adolescent in-patient units at Abbott, Fairview, and University of Minnesota Hospitals in Minneapolis indicate that more than 50% of their patients diagnosed as having emotional disturbances (neurotic, schizophrenic, psychotic) are at grade level or above in reading. Reading was often used as an escape from relating to people.

It was suggested by these teachers that the patients diagnosed as having anti-social behaviors, those behaviors which most disturb classrooms, were almost always below grade level in reading, and that their anti-social behaviors most often began in early childhood and affected their ability to attend in academic programs.

These children were not learning disabled in the sense that they had specific learning disabilities unless you call the inability to attend because of behavioral patterns a specific learning disability. They are academically retarded or academically immobilized or whatever you choose to call them and they will need intense programming in the area

of behavior before they move academically. I am not sure that the learning disabilities program in most school systems is able to do that on an all day basis -- which is surely indicated.

One of the puzzling things about the child with emotional problems is that we are never sure whether he can or won't learn. He has such well developed defense mechanisms that it is difficult to test him, difficult to initiate appropriate remedial programs for him, difficult to get him in emotional shape to attend. He has developed survival techniques that are difficult to change because they have been useful and protective for him. Survival behaviors do not extinguish easily.

I would like to point out one last hazard for these children in our society -- that of the constantly changing and often turbulent structure of educational settings. There are open schools, and closed schools, and primary only settings, and middle schools, and isolated schools and huge complexes of schools, and elementary schools, and junior high schools and senior high schools, and various combinations of grades and vocational schools, and neighborhood schools, and across town schools and private schools, parochial schools, and public schools. All of these schools have merit and limitations -- a great many of them have been designed to respond to the economic needs and crushes of the times, the political demands, the court demands, and innovative cycles of today. The severe behavior child or the disturbed child is best served in a well structured consistent setting, with rules well established, where he can get to know the staff and stay with them for longer periods of time in order to build stability in his life, where he feels secure, where he does not have to constantly make new adjustments daily, where people know and understand him. To move this type of child from setting to setting, to bus him all over the city, to force him to constantly make new adjustments when any

adjustment is difficult, to force him to establish new relationships when he has few skills in this area, to keep his life turbulent with imposed changes is not only unproductive for him but damaging to him. Some children can make those adjustments. The child with emotional problems most often cannot. I think, as special educators, we ought to make ourselves be heard on that subject and heard clearly and well.

Such are the hazards that we put in the path of the child with emotional problems. Can we cause emotional problems in children with learning disabilities? Should we serve emotionally disturbed children in the Special Learning disabilities area? There are many children with minimal emotional problems that we can serve in these programs. Children who will respond to a structured environment without intensive intervention requirements. Certainly we can serve children with transitional problems, divorce in the family, death in the family, transitional fears and anxieties. It will require additional training for most Special Learning Disabilities teachers. We cannot, however, truthfully claim to work effectively with children with more severe behavioral or emotional problems. Those children need full day programs for some period of time. Programs that allow for full control of the environment, allow for time with children on a full day basis, that allow for working with parents, that allow for careful evaluation and program change when necessary. Programs staffed with specialists in the area of emotional disturbance as well as learning disabilities. Children need not be in such programs indefinitely -- only until they have a change to straighten out the complex of their lives with skilled help. In our great enthusiasm for keeping all children in the regular classroom we must not overlook the needs of children and the program structures that must be designed to help them.

I am less concerned with what we call the program than with what the program offers to meet the needs of children.

Children see themselves as of value or not of value as it is reflected by our behavior toward them -- our verbal behavior, and our non-verbal behavior. If we share honestly and openly with the child the nature of his problems and the plan for remediation and the on-going evaluation of his progress, he sees himself as important. If we treat him as a person who like all people, has strengths and limitations, he can accept that. If we plan the remediation program well so that he can experience some success, he will move forward. If we share with him our knowledge that his efforts are difficult and energy consuming, and make allowances for that in program, he will flourish. If we bring into his life the knowledge that enjoyment and pleasure and reward is not for winners only, he will work for those goals. If we make him feel that we consider him an individual worthy of respect and we respect his family and his background he will grow rapidly in respecting himself. If we provide none of these, of the reverse of these, yes, we can cause emotional problems in learning disabled children. They are very vulnerable, and it is important that the learning disability be put in the proper perspective and not all consuming. What methods should you use to work with children with behavioral problems? What philosophy should you pursue? That is an individual program decision. Behavior modification works well with many children and often allows an avenue to get behavior under control. It is not the answer for all children or for all teachers. Whatever method you use it must incorporate the essential components, structure, consistency, careful planning and measuring of tasks, realistic expectations, honest communication with children, evaluation feedback, and a positive atmosphere in which to work, people-wise and facility-wise. There must be communication between people working with the child - family, agencies,

other staff, and other significant persons in the child life. If you expected me to give you an ideal model or a perfect solution, I am sorry to disappoint you. Programs should grow from the needs of children in a specific environment. It should be a result of cooperative planning between regular educators, special educators, and supportive personnel in this environment and should include the child and his family in appropriate steps of planning. As a learning disability specialist, you must carry full responsibilities for the educational and emotional components of the programs -- children need your expertise and you must make it available for them.

So, I have talked long about problems and short about solutions. I do have some recommendations to educators and administrators and they are:

1. Get out in your communities and find out what is happening to kids -- all kids -- all ages -- all cultural groups. Children with problems are relying on you and you will not serve them well if you hide in your own little learning disabilities area and miss the bigger picture. How do you know where you fit in the entire spectrum of helping children unless you are aware of that entire spectrum. Children should be our specialty..not just one facet of teaching children such as learning disabilities. Be an advocate for children in all areas of their life.

2. Be honest with children. Listen to them. Work WITH them. Let them share in the planning so that they may enjoy the victories. If you can't explain to the child, in vocabulary be can understand, why he is having trouble in the world of academia, then you don't really understand it yourself.

3. For the disturbed or disturbing child, don't pretend you can help him if you cannot. Fight for better programs for these children with emotional problems, whether they be private schools or public schools, or settings within either. If you cannot help him, find someone who can -- keep insisting that better help is available to him. There is great suffering among children who have severe behavioral and emotional problems. Recognize that underneath that behavior is an extremely unhappy child. You can be some part of making his life more bearable and more productive. Seek out that part that you can play.

4. Interpret the field of learning disabilities realistically to the community. Insist that all segments of our adult society assume responsibility for what is happening to children. You are not a cure-all. You are a much needed member of a larger team.

5. Work toward less fragmentation in the lives of children. This is particularly important with children with emotional problems Fragmentation breeds inconsistency and inconsistency breeds insecurity and insecurity breeds failure and failure breeds lack of trust and a lack of trust immobilizes children in our society. You can work toward great continuity of services in your classroom, and in your school -- it is important to start.

6. Be a strong advocate for training in the area of behavior for not only special education teachers but for regular school staff. It is not something everyone knows automatically. There are excellent programs to examine, excellent authorities to consult, excellent workshops to give. If there aren't excellent training programs available promote them or improve them. Training institutions will listen when the client speaks, but you must speak.

I would like to share one last incident with you -- one which has stayed with me. In the school for disturbed children which I directed we had a 12 year old boy who had been excluded from a variety of schools and whose father had a lawsuit pending against the school system because a principal hit his child. This boy was in a difficult position. He could not like the staff because that would be disloyal to his father and detrimental to the law suit. He could not admit that he was guilty of doing a single thing wrong for the same reasons. One day an aide came to me with Jim in tow and told me that he has slapped her on the fanny. As we did not allow children to hit staff or staff to hit children, this was a serious offense. I took Jim into my office and told him, "Now, today, Jim, you are going to have to admit fault for some part of that incident. I don't care what it is, but you will have to assume responsibility for some part of your actions in that incident. You will stay with me until you do. You may be in this office or the outer office but I would strongly advise you not to go beyond the outer office." He screamed and he yelled and he called me every name in the books -- most of which I

had heard often before in the setting so that had little impact. He kicked the chairs and stomped on the floor and the usual run of behavior. He threw himself out into the outer office and slammed the door. This went on for about an hour and a half and finally he grew more quiet. After a few minutes of quiet, he opened the door, stuck his handsome, surly face through the door and shouted, "O.K., if you're such a damn big expert, what do I do next?" We moved on then to work out the problem with him, but I think his question was a verbalization of the quandry of many disturbed and disturbing children -- given the fact that I now realize that some changes have to be made in my life, what do I do next?

What will you answer when the next child, meshed in a perplexing world of emotional problems asks you that question? You had better have an answer, a plan, an support system available to him. If you do not have, it is time to start earnestly searching for one. What will we do next?

1. KNOW WHAT IS HAPPENING TO CHILDREN IN SOCIETY.

2. BE HONEST WITH CHILDREN.

3. DON'T PRETEND YOU CAN HELP CHILDREN YOU CANNOT HELP.

4. INTERPRET THE FIELD OF LEARNING DISABILITIES REALISTICALLY.

5. WORK TOWARD LESS FRAGMENTATION IN THE LIVES OF CHILDREN.

6. BE AN ADVOCATE FOR TRAINING IN THE AREA OF BEHAVIOR FOR ALL TEACHERS.

QUARTERLY

April, May, June, 1976

Students Received and Released

RECEIVED	42 Students	Range
Age		12-10 to 17-5
Grade Level		6-8 11-9
WRAT (Jastak Wide Range Achievement Test)		
	Reading	1.1 to 12.4
	Spelling	2.2 10.8
	Math	2.1 13.3
PPVT (Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test) I.Q. Equivalency		74 - 114

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

RELEASED	48 Students	Range
Age		13-7 to 18-1
Grade Level		8-12 12
Days Attendance		48 390
WRAT (Jastak Wide Range Achievement Test)		
	Reading Incoming	2.2 to 14.7
	Outgoing	1.8 14.1
	Spelling Incoming	2.6 11.2
	Outgoing	2.6 12.4
	Math Incoming	2.9 11.3
	Outgoing	2.3 13.3

QUARTERLY REPORT

January-March, 1976

Students Received and Released

RECEIVED - 35 Students		Range
Age		13-5 to 17-9
Grade Level		7-5 to 11-7
WRAT (Wide Range Achievement Test)		
Reading		1.6 to 13.5
Spelling		2.6 to 10.8
Math		2.9 to 11.3
PPVT (Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test)		
I.Q. Equivalency		57 to 127

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

RELEASED - 17 Students		Range
Age		13-2 to 17-3
Grade Level		8-5 to 11-7
Days Attendance		94 to 350
WRAT (Wide Range Achievement Test)		
Reading	Incoming	3.5 to 12.2
	Outgoing	4.2 to 13.2
Spelling	Incoming	2.2 to 12.0
	Outgoing	3.3 to 12.0
Arithmetic	Incoming	3.4 to 12.3
	Outgoing	3.9 to 14.9

READING SCORES OF GIRLS ENTERING HOME OF GOOD SHEPHERD

GRADE LEVEL OF GIRLS TESTED	NO. OF GIRLS TESTED	NO. SCORING ABOVE GRADE LEVEL IN WRAT	% SCORING ABOVE GRADE LEVEL	RANGE OF SCORES
7	9	4	44%	2.6 - 9.1
8	19	9	47%	4.2 - 13.2
9	31	12	38%	7.5 - 12.6
10	54	23	43%	4.6 - 13.0
11	47	13	28%	4.4 - 13.0
12	20	7	35%	6.2 - 16.8

TABLE 3

TOTAL ARRESTS FOR PART I INDEX CRIMES BY AGE CATEGORY IN HENNEPIN COUNTY 1975

	Under 18		18 to 25		25 & Over		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Murder	1	-	11	31%	24	67%	36
Rape	13	19%	28	41%	27	40%	68
Robbery	339	57%	158	27%	97	16%	594
Aggravated Assault	134	44%	83	27%	85	28%	302
Burglary	1,635	77%	327	15%	173	8%	2,135
Larceny	4,086	56%	1,585	22%	1,611	22%	7,282
Auto Theft	883	91%	72	7%	18	2%	973
Total	7,091	62%	2,264	20%	2,035	18%	11,390

TABLE 4

TOTAL ARRESTS FOR PART I INDEX CRIMES BY RACE CATEGORY IN HENNEPIN COUNTY 1975

	White		Black		Native American		Other		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total
Murder	20	48%	18	43%	2	5%	2	5%	42
Rape	45	66%	21	31%	1	1%	1	1%	68
Robbery	272	45%	245	41%	68	11%	13	2%	598
Aggravated Assault	170	56%	88	29%	37	12%	7	2%	302
Burglary	1,638	77%	262	12%	200	9%	36	2%	2,136
Larceny	5,688	78%	1,121	15%	330	5%	144	2%	7,283
Auto Theft	616	76%	36	4%	116	14%	45	6%	813
Total	8,449	75%	1,791	16%	754	7%	248	2%	11,242